DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 076 978 24 CS 000 593

AUTHOR Johnson, Kenneth R.; Simons, Herbert D.
TITLE Black Children's Reading of Dialect and Standard Texts. Final Report.
INSTITUTION California Univ., Berkeley.
SPONS AGENCY National Center for Educational Research and Development (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Regional Research Program.
BUREAU NO BR 1-I-096
PUB DATE Apr 73
CONTRACT OEC-9-72-0011(057)
NOTE 53p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Dialect Studies; Elementary Education; Grade 2; Grade 3; *Language Handicaps; *Language Research; *Negro Dialects; Oral Reading; *Reading Comprehension; *Reading Materials; Reading Research; Standard Spoken Usage; Textbooks

ABSTRACT

In an attempt to demonstrate that the mismatch between the grammatical features of Black dialect and Standard English grammar used in children's reading materials is a source of reading interference, 67 second and third grade Black dialect speaking children each read orally a text written in Black dialect and a parallel text written in Standard English. Subjects also retold the contents of the texts and answered multiple-choice comprehension questions. The analysis of oral reading miscues and the measures of comprehension formed the dependent variables for the study. It was hypothesized that the dialect text, because it reduced the mismatch between the children's language and the printed language, would produce greater comprehension, more effective use of contextual and graphophonic information and fewer dialect-related miscues than the Standard English text. The results of the analysis, however, failed to support the prediction of the reading interference hypothesis, as no differences were found between the dialect and standard texts on comprehension, use of contextual information, and use of graphophonic information. On dialect related miscues, the results were in the opposite direction of that predicted by the hypothesis. (Author/MF)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 076978

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Final Report

Project No. 1-I-096
~~Grant~~ No. OEC-9-72-0011 (057)
CONTRACT

BLACK CHILDREN'S READING OF DIALECT AND STANDARD TEXTS

Kenneth R. Johnson
University of California
Berkeley, California 94720
and
Herbert D. Simons
University of California
Berkeley, California 94720

April 1973

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a Grant with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
National Center for Educational Research and Development

CS 000 583

ABSTRACT

This study attempted to demonstrate that the mismatch between the grammatical features of Black dialect and standard English grammar used in children's reading materials is a source of reading interference. Sixty seven second and third grade Black dialect speaking children were selected for the study on the basis of the number of dialect features produced on a sentence repetition task. In a repeated measure design each subject read orally a text written in Black dialect and a parallel text written in standard English. Subjects also retold the contents of the texts and answered multiple choice comprehension questions. The analysis of oral reading miscues and the measures of comprehension formed the dependent variables for the study. These were comprehension, use of contextual information, use of graphophonic information, and dialec related miscues. Multiple measures were used for each dependent variable, and these measures were subjected to a multivariate analysis.

The hypothesis of reading interference led to the prediction that the dialect text, because it reduced the mismatch between the children's language and the printed language would produce greater comprehension, more effective use of contextual and graphophonic information and fewer dialect related miscues than the standard English text.

The results of the analysis failed to support the prediction of the reading interference hypothesis. No differences were found between the dialect and standard texts on comprehension, use of contextual information and use of graphophonic information. On dialect related miscues, the results were in the opposite direction of that predicted by the hypothesis. This study offered no support for the hypothesis that the mismatch between the grammatical features of Black dialect and the standard English of children's reading materials is a source of reading interference.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors thank the Oakland City Schools, Oakland, California, for cooperation in conducting this study. Particularly, the authors give special thanks to Mr. Don Fulsaas and Mr. Arthur Swenson, principals of the two schools where the study was conducted.

In addition, the authors thank the following graduate students at the School of Education, University of California, Berkeley, who helped in collecting and coding data: Kendra Bersamin; Jacquelyn Housh; Anabel Leslie Jensen; Laurel Littman; Grover Mathewson; William Michaels; Teri Rudinsky; Elizabeth Schaaf; Gloria Smallwood; Patty Swatt, and Stella Welty.

Finally, the authors thank Miss Leslie James for her typing and clerical help.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter I - Introduction 1

Grammatical Reading Interference: The Research Evidence 2

Chapter II - Research Design and Procedures 5

Hypothesis 5

Experimental Design 6

Subjects of the Study 6

Procedures for Selecting Subjects, School A 7

Procedures for Selecting Subjects, School B 8

Sentence Repetition Task 9

Development of Standard and Dialect Texts 11

Data Collection Proceudres 16

Coding of Oral Reading Miscues 17

Coding of Story Retell 17

Description of Variables 17

Chapter III - Analysis of Data 28

Introduction 28

Results 28

Summary 34

Chapter IV - Conclusions 35

Bibliography 39

Appendix 42

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Distributions of Subjects by Grade, School and Sex 7

Table 2: Distribution of Subjects on Sentence Repetition Task by Number of Dialect Features 8

Table 3: Distribution of Subjects on Sentence Repetition Task by Number of Dialect Features 9

Table 4: Controlled Grammatical Features 12

Table 5: Texts A and B (Dialect and Standard) Total Sentences, Total Words and Total Syllables 13

Table 6: Graphic Similarity - Miscues 22

Table 7: Graphic Similarity - Scoring System 23

Table 8: Examples of Dialect Shifts at Controlled Conflict Points .. 24

Table 9: Difficulty of Four Texts 26

Table 10: Univariate and Multivariate Analysis--ST and DIAL Texts on Comprehension Measures 28

Table 11: Multivariate Analysis of Comprehension RECALL, RECALL UNP, RECALL DIAL, SUB, OM, INS, COMP MC 29

Table 12: Univariate and Multivariate Analysis ST - DIAL Texts on Context Measures 29

Table 13: Multivariate Analysis of Context Measures--SCORR, SYN 1, SYN 2, SEM, REP 30

Table 14: Univariate and Multivariate Analysis ST--DIAL Texts in Graphophonic Measures (N=67) 30

Table 15: Multivariate Analysis of Graphophonic Measures GRAPHIC L, GRAPHIC S, WD ATTACK 31

Table 16: Univariate and Multivariate Analysis ST-DIAL Texts on Dialect-Related Measures 32

Table 17: Multivariate Analysis of Dialect-Related Variables: T DIAL, SH, T DIAL SH UNC, SCORR CP, REP CP 32

Table 18: Text (ST-D) x GRADE Interaction on T DIAL SH 33

Table 19: Correlation: TOT DIAL SH vs COMPREHENSION 33

CHAPTER I - INTRODUCTION

Black children as a group are not learning to read (Coleman, 1966; NAEP, 1972); this well documented fact is a major problem facing American education. Large numbers of Black children, particularly in urban areas, are not acquiring the reading skills necessary to function adequately in our society. In recent years, one explanation that has been advanced for Black children's inability to learn to read is that they are required to read a variety of English they don't speak.

There are two views of Black children's language: these two views are commonly referred to as the deficit and difference views. The deficit view is held by the bulk of the educational establishment, including educational psychologists, reading specialists, teachers and administrators. They believe that the language of Black children is an inferior form of standard English. The most extreme proponents of the deficit view even believe that Black children have no language at all. The language deficit group believe Black children have a languague deficit because they don't speak standard English, which they feel is the only acceptable variety of English for achievement in school and acceptance in society. Since language and reading are so closely related, Black children's language makes it difficult if not impossible for them to learn to read adequately.

The difference view is held by linguists, anthropologists and some educators. They recognize that Black children speak a dialect of English. Black dialect (hereafter referred to as BD) as an expression of Black culture is a viable system of communication and as such is different from standard English (hereafter referred to as SE) in its phonological and grammatical systems but in no way inferior to it. In their view, the problems Black children have in learning to read are due to the fact that the schools operate with and recognize only SE. The reading problem is caused by the unwillingness of the schools to recognize BD as a legitimate form of communication and to accommodate the curriculum to fit the differences between BD and SE.

Both the deficit and difference points of views assume that Black children's language interferes with their acquisition of reading skills. The two points of views differ in their proposed remedy for the problem. The deficit group would eliminate BD and replace it with SE. Thus, the source of the problem would be removed. The difference group would change the schools, methods and materials for teaching reading in order to accommodate the language patterns of Black children.

Specifically, some educators and linguists from the difference group--notably, Johnson (1971), Baratz (1969) and Stewart (1969)--have proposed that Black children be taught to read with reading materials written in the grammatical system of BD. Such reading materials would presumably eliminate the cause of the reading problems by reducing the grammatical mismatch between the children's language and the language of the readers.

In the debate over the use of dialect readers, as well as in the discussions of eliminating Black children's dialect, it has been assumed that the difference between the grammatical features of Black children's dialect and the standard English grammatical features of the readers is an important reason that Black children have trouble learning to read.[1]

It is the purpose of this study to provide empirical evidence on the validity of the assumption of grammatical reading interference. Before describing this study, however, the research evidence on the question of grammatical reading interference will be reviewed.

Grammatical Reading Interference: The Research Evidence

The empirical evidence on the question of grammatical reading interference produced by studies is reviewed in this section. These studies examined grammatical reading interference by attempting to reduce the mismatch between the children's spoken language and the written language of the text, and then to determine whether or not reading improved as a consequence of the reduction of the mismatch. This reduction presumably reduced interference. A facilitation of reading was taken as evidence of interference. Interference was reduced in one of two ways; either some attempt was made to change the child's oral language so that it conformed more closely to the written language of the text; or, the written language was changed in such a way as to conform more closely to the child's oral language.

Rentel and Kennedy (1972) employed the former approach by attempting to change the children's oral language. They studied the effects of pattern drill in SE on first grade Appalachian dialect speakers and its influence on reading achievement. Since Appalachian dialect was studied and not BD, the study is not an exact test of the question of interference for BD speakers. However, BD and Appalachian dialect have a number of features in common

---

1. In the remainder of this report, the term grammatical interference will be used to refer to interference with comprehension and other aspects of the reading process that is associated with and presumably caused by the mismatch referred to above. It is assumed that grammatical reading interference is operant at all stages of the reading acquisition process.

and they are both dialects of English, so that the results might be generalized to BD speakers. They compared the reading achievement of three experimental classes who received pattern drill in the phonological and grammatical features of SE that conflict with Appalachian dialect with three control classes who received no special training. Thus, they attempted to manipulate the amount of dialect to see if it affected reading achievement. If dialect interferred, the group that received training in SE should have experienced less interference and done better in reading than the comparable group who had no training and experience.

Employing a post-test only design, Rentel and Kennedy found no difference in reading achievement between the experimental and control groups. On the face of it, this study fails to support phonological and grammatical interference. Of course, phonological and grammatical treatments were confounded in this study and their separate effects can't be examined. But it is unlikely that either alone would have influenced reading when both together did not.

There are other problems with the study that may weaken the negative findings. First, the sampling procedure they used may not have insured equality of experimental and control groups, since they only used random assignment of whole classes. The sample size was six classes. Randomly assigning only six classes to experimental and control groups does not insure equality of experimental and control groups. This problem is further enlarged by the post-test only design that was used because there was no pretest. Thus, it is impossible to check whether the groups were equal to begin with or to use covariance adjustment if they were not equal. It is not possible to assess the effect of the treatment because the groups may have differed to begin with. Thus, the negative evidence that this study provides on the question of grammatical reading interference is ambiguous.

The next set of studies attempted the second approach of manipulating the written language so that the language of the text would conform more closely to the children's spoken language. This approach bears more closely on the question of the use of dialect readers. Ruddell (1965) and Tatham (1970) employed this approach on SE speaking white elementary school children. They both found that these children comprehended material written with sentence patterns more frequently used in their oral language better than material written in sentence patterns less frequently used in their oral language. These studies then demonstrated that the reduction of the mismatch between children's oral language and the language of the material that they read facilitated comprehension; and, conversely, less frequent patterns interfered with comprehension. If these findings can be generalized to BD speakers, then one would expect that BD speakers would comprehend written materials that

conform to the grammatical patterns of their dialect better than materials written in SE which deviates from their oral language. If empirical evidence can be produced to support generalizing these findings, then the notion of grammatical reading interference would be a viable hypothesis.

Two studies have been conducted that bear on this point. They employed materials written to conform to the grammatical features of BD and attempted to determine whether these materials facilitated reading and thus reduced interference.

In the first study, Schaaf (1971) had eight third grade Black students read texts written in BD and SE. She found that subjects had better comprehension of and made fewer reading errors in the standard stories. They also, in reading orally, shifted from BD to SE more often than they shifted from SE to BD. Thus, the Shaaf study failed to support the notion of grammatical reading interference.

In another study, Sims (1972) had ten second grade Black children read stories written in BD and SE. She used stories from the Baratz and Shuy readers. She analyzed the reading miscues made by the children. Unfortunately, she failed to make the appropriate comparison between the standard and dialect stories. Her data, however, if analyzed properly would show similar results as the Schaaf study. The subjects did better with the stories written in SE.

Both of these studies had methodological limitations that weaken their findings. First, their sample size was small. Second, they failed to equate and balance the standard and dialect stories properly both for difficulty and for dialect features. Third, the statistical analysis of the data was primitive.

The methodological problems with both the Schaaf and Sims studies weaken their negative findings on the question of grammatical reading interference. When the evidence reviewed here is taken together, the question of grammatical reading interference remains an open one. A more methodologically sound attempt to replicate the Ruddell and Tatham findings with BD speaking children appears necessary to help answer the questions of grammatical reading interference. The remainder of this report describes such a study.

CHAPTER II - RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

Hypothesis:

This study investigated the question of grammatical reading interference for BD speaking children. An attempt was made to reduce grammatical interference by using texts written to conform to the grammatical features of BD and comparing Black children's reading of these texts with their reading of SE texts. If reading is facilitated by the texts written in BD in relation to the texts written in SE, then all other things being equal, the existence of dialect reading interference would be confirmed. Thus, the general hypothesis of this study is: BD speaking second and third grade children will read dialect texts better than standard texts.

In this study, various components of reading were examined and the following specific hypotheses were tested:

Hypothesis 1:

BD speaking second and third grade children will read dialect texts with greater comprehension than standard texts.

Hypothesis 2:

BD speaking second and third grade children will exhibit greater use of contextual information when reading dialect texts than when reading standard texts.

Hypothesis 3:

BD speaking second and third grade children will exhibit greater use of graphophonic information when reading dialect texts than when reading standard texts.

Hypothesis 4:

BD speaking second and third grade children will exhibit fewer dialect related miscues when reading dialect texts than when reading standard texts.

Experimental Design:

The testing of the hypotheses of this study involved a comparison of the way children who are BD speakers read dialect and standard texts. A repeated measure design was employed in which each child (henceforth refered to as subject) read a dialect and standard text. A series of measures were taken of various aspects of the subjects' reading of each text. These measures constitute the dependent variables of the study. The comparison of the standard and dialect texts on these measures through a series of multivariate analyses of variance was used to test the hypotheses of the study. This same comparison was made for subgroups of the total subjects divided according to grade level, reading ability, degree of dialect and sex.

The nature of the repeated measure design required the development of two texts, each with standard and dialect versions. After the initial screening, subjects were randomly assigned to one of four groups. This balanced the type of text read and the order of presentation of the standard and dialect versions between testing sessions as follows:

	GROUP I	GROUP II	GROUP III	GROUP IV
Testing Session 1	TEXT A (Standard)	TEXT B (Standard)	TEXT A (Dialect)	TEXT B (Dialect)
Testing Session 2	TEXT B (Dialect)	TEXT A (Dialect)	TEXT B (Standard)	TEXT A (Standard)

Subjects of the Study:

The subjects for this study were 67 second and third grade Black children selected from two elementary schools (School A and School B) in Oakland, California. Both schools were designated Title I schools by the Oakland Unified School District. According to the school district definition, a Title I school is one which contains a majority of low SES children. Thus, it can be assumed that at least a majority of the subjects in this study were low SES In addition, studies have indicated a high correlation between low SES and Black dialect speakers (Wolfram, 1969). The population, therefore, could be expected to contain a large proportion of dialect speakers. The distribution of the 67 subjects by school, grade, and sex is shown in Table 1:

TABLE 1: Distributions of Subjects by Grade, School and Sex

School	Grade 2		Grade 3		
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Totals
A	16	6	10	7	39
B	6	7	8	7	28
TOTALS:	22	13	18	14	67

Procedures for Selecting Subjects, School A:

In School A, 59 second and third grade subjects were given a sentence repetition task (described later). In this task, subjects were asked to repeat specially constructed sentences read aloud to them. The purpose of the sentence repetition task was to identify BD speaking subjects. Due to unforeseen circumstances, the subjects had to be selected for the study before the sentence repetition task was analyzed.

This resulted in the inclusion of three subjects from School A who would have been eliminated if the results of the sentence repetition task had been available. This small number was too few to have changed the results of the study.

A total of 20 subjects were dropped because they were judged to be non-readers. A non-reader was defined as one who made at least one reading miscue every two words.

A total of 39 subjects from School A were included in the study. Table 2 shows the distribution of these subjects according to the number of dialect features produced on the sentence repetition task.

TABLE 2: Distribution of Subjects on Sentence Repetition Task by Number of Dialect Features

SCHOOL A

Number of Dialect Features	Number of Subjects
0	1
1	0
2	2
3	5
4	5
5	7
6	8
7	1
8	2
9	3
10	1
11	3
12	0
13	0
14	1
TOTAL:	39

Procedures for Selecting Subjects, School B:

In School B, 43 second and third grade subjects were given a shortened version of the sentence repetition task. The task was scored for the number of dialect features. Those subjects who produced three or more dialect features were selected for the study from this school. Any subjects who were non-readers or who failed to complete all the testing sessions were dropped. The final number of subjects was 28, and their distribution according to the number of dialect features is shown in Table 3: (next page)

TABLE 3: Distribution of Subjects on Sentence Repetition Task by Number of Dialect Features

SCHOOL B

Number of Dialect Features	Number of Subjects
3	2
4	8
5	5
6	5
7	1
8	3
9	3
10	0
11	1
TOTAL:	28

Sentence Repetition Task:

The sentence repetition task used to select BD speaking subjects for the study consisted of SE sentences which contained grammatical features which are either absent from or different in BD. To do this task a subject first listened to a sentence and then repeated it.

Baratz (1969) found that on this type of task BD speaking subjects tended to change SE features into dialect features. A shortened version of the Baratz task was developed for this study. It focussed on the specific grammatical features that were used in the texts developed for the study. These texts are described later.

Actually, two sentence repetition tasks were used in this study. The first version which had nine sentences was given to children in School A. By reducing the number of conflict points[1] a six-sentence version of the task was developed and used in School B.

The task was administered by four graduate students in School A. In School B the task was administered by one of the principal investi-

1. A conflict point is a grammatical feature in SE which has an equivalent feature in dialect. In order to shift from SE to BD at these conflict points the subject can either substitute the standard feature with a dialect feature or omit a standard feature.

gators. Each subject did the task individually. First the directions were read to the subject and one practice sentence was given. Then each test sentence was read to the subject who repeated it. The performance was tape recorded.

The directions for both tests were:

> Directions: I am going to read some sentences to you. After I read a sentence, you repeat it. Listen carefully and repeat each sentence after I read it....Let's try one:
>
> The sun is shining and it's a pretty day outside so I will play with my friends.

(If a child doesn't understand, repeat directions and explain further.)

The sentence repetition task developed for this study consists of the nine sentences below. The shortened version was made up of sentences number 1, 2, 4, 6 and 7. The parenthetical sentences which follow are the same sentences when every conflict point is changed into dialect.

1. The little boy said to himself, I wonder if it rains in the country and if trees and flowers grow there. (The little boy say to his self, I wonder do it rain in the country and do trees and flowers grow there.)

2. The boy's mother wakes him up, helps him get ready for school, and cooks his breakfast. (The boy mother wake him up, help him get ready for school, and cook his breakfast.)

3. That boy doesn't want any breakfast because he does not ever enjoy what his mother cooks. (That boy don't want no breakfast because he don't never enjoy what his mother cook.)

4. Some boys are playing ball, and some girls are playing jump rope, but some childrens don't play anything at recess. (Some boy playing ball, and some girl playing jump rope, but some childrens don't play nothing at recess.)

5. The boy looked at the new car and said to himself that car is pretty and it is fast, too. (That boy look at the new car and say to his self that car pretty and it fast, too.)

6. The girl's friend took a walk and after she came back she wrote a letter to her friend. (The girl friend taken a walk and after she come back she written a letter to her friend.)

7. When the boy saw the bad dog, he ran all the way home because bad dogs are always biting people. (When the boy seen the bad dog he run all the way home because bad dogs always be biting peoples.)

8. In the morning, after the cat has eaten all the food, he crawls under the bed and he goes to sleep. (In the morning, after the cat done ate all the food, he crawl under the bed and he go to sleep.)

9. That dog is cute, he is black, he is little, and he is barking. (That dog cute, he black, he little, and he barking.)

The two principal investigators listened to the sentence repetition task tapes and tabulated the number of dialect features produced. There was almost 100 percent agreement between the investigators.

Development of Standard and Dialect Texts:

Two stories were used as texts for this study. Each story was written in two versions, SE and BD. Thus, there was a total of four stories. Both stories were originally written by primary grade children and were talking animal stories. They were chosen because primary grade children are familiar with this type of story and because they appear to be free of cultural bias. One story was about a pig (Text A) and one story was about a chicken (Text B).

The original stories were rewritten to control certain grammatical features. That is, the two stories were rewritten to contain an equal number of certain grammatical features that are conflict points between SE and BD. Nine grammatical features were controlled (copula, one of the grammatical features controlled, had two sub-categories, also, grammatical-lexical, had two subcategories). Table 4, on the next page, lists the features controlled, and the number of times each feature appeared in each of the stories.

TABLE 4: Controlled Grammatical Features

Grammatical Feature	Number of Times Grammatical Feature Appears in Each Story
1. Copula	
to be, present tense	3
to be, present progressive tense	2
to be, "habitual" tense	3
Total Copula:	8
2. Conditional	2
3. Grammatical-Lexical Substitution	
said, (substitution of say for said)	5
himself, (substitution of hisself for himself)	1
4. Negation	
multiple negation in Black dialect	3
5. Possessive	1
6. Third Person Singular Present Tense	4
7. Irregular Verbs	
irregular verbs, past tense	3
irregular verbs, present perfect tense	1
8. Auxiliary Verb	
have, (substitution of done for have in BD)	1
9. Pronominal Apposition	
(double subject)	4
TOTALS:	33

These nine grammatical features appeared in the same sentences in both linguistic versions of each of the two stories. In other words, both the SE version and the BD version of each of the two stories contained the same frequency of the nine grammatical features controlled.

The nine features selected for control in this study have been shown in a number of other studies to occur frequently in the speech

of Black children (Dillard, 1972; Fasold and Wolfram, 1970; Johnson, 1969; and Lobov, 1968). All of the major grammatical features of BD were controlled except for the plural morpheme which was arbitrarily excluded from control because of the difficulty of equalizing the number of features between the texts. In addition, the past tense morpheme was excluded from control on the grounds that it was clearly of phonological origin even though it was subject to grammatical constraints. The decision to control features such as copula deletion was made even though it has been argued that this feature is phonological in origin because a strong case could be made for considering it to be of grammatical origin.

All decisions on the control of features was made on the basis of the intuitive criterion of naturalness by one of the principle investigators (Kenneth R. Johnson) who is a native BD dialect speaker.

The texts also contained some conflict points that were not controlled, i.e. they appear in SE in all four stories. Two of these were the plural and past tense morphemes which were excluded from control for reasons discussed above.

All four stories were equated in difficulty. Their readability was low second grade as determined by the Fry (1968) readability formula. They also contained the same number of sentences and were very close in the total number of words and syllables as shown in Table 5:

TABLE 5: Texts A and B (Dialect and Standard)
Total Sentences, Total Words and Total Syllables

Story	Total Sentences	Total Words	Total Syllables
TEXT A:			
Pig - Standard	32	257	283
Pig - Dialect	32	257	280
TEXT B:			
Chicken - Standard	32	256	291
Chicken - Dialect	32	257	288

The SE and BD versions of the two texts are as follows:

TEXT A (PIG): STANDARD

This is a story about a little pig. His name is Sam. Sam lives on a farm. One day Sam wanted to go away from the farm. He found a hole in the fence. He looked at it to see if he could get out. He said, "I can get out of that hole." So he did! Then he ran and ran out into the woods. When he got to the

woods he said "I am happy to be in the woods and away from the farm." Sam began to walk in the woods. He looked at all the things in the woods. Then he saw a bear! Sam said, "That bear looks bad. And he is a big bear, too. He also looks like he wants to eat. He is eating some nuts off a tree." "I wonder if he likes to eat little pigs?" Sam said to himself. Sam did not want a bear to eat him! Sam's mother told him that bears were always eating. And that they were bad, too! So Sam hid in some trees. Soon the bear went away. Sam said, "That bear has eaten all the nuts. Now, he is going away. I will go away from these trees, too." So Sam ran all the way back to the farm. He looked for the hole in the fence. He went under it. Sam was happy to be back on the farm. "The woods are not a good place for me! I don't ever want to go to the woods again!"

TEXT A (PIG): DIALECT

This a story about a little pig. His name Sam. Sam he live on a farm. One day Sam wanted to go away from the farm. He found a hole in the fence. He looked at it to see could he get out. He say, "I can get out of that hole." So he did. Then Sam he run and run out into the woods. When he got to the woods he say, "I am happy to be in the woods and away from the farm." Sam began to walk in the woods. He looked at all the things in the woods. Then he seen a bear! Sam say, "That bear look bad. And he a big bear, too. He also look like he want to eat. He eating some nuts off a tree." "I wonder do he like to eat little pigs?" Sam say to his self. Sam did not want no bear to eat him! Sam mother told him that bears be eating all the time. And that they be bad, too! So Sam he hid in some trees. Soon the bear went away. Sam say, "That bear done ate all the nuts. Now, he going away. I will go away from these trees, too." So Sam he run all the way back to the farm. He looked for the hole in the fence.

He went under it. Sam was happy to be back on the farm. "The woods don't be no place for me! I don't never want to go to the woods again!"

TEXT B (CHICKEN): STANDARD

Pat is a little chicken. He did not like to go to bed at night. Mother hen would say, "It is time for bed." But Pat would say, "I don't want to go to bed." All the little chickens would say, "Pat is always playing when it is time for bed." One night Pat's mother said, "We are going to bed. Pat wants to stay up. He likes to play. We will see if he likes to play all night." Then she said, "Pat is a bad little chicken." Mother hen and all the little chickens got in bed. Pat said to himself, "They have gone to bed. I am going to play all night." He ran all around the farm playing. Then he saw a cow. "He looks like he will play with me," Pat said. He walked up to the cow to see if he could get the cow to play. But the cow was asleep! He took a walk to find the pig. But the pig was asleep! Pat said, "All the animals are sleeping at night. Nobody wants to play." Pat did not want to stay up anymore. Pat was cold. He wanted to go to bed. But he did not have a bed. He had to stay up all night! In the morning, mother hen asked Pat, "Did you have a good time?" "No, no." "Will you go to bed at night?" asked mother hen. "Yes, yes." Now, Pat is the first little chicken in bed at night.

TEXT B (CHICKEN): DIALECT

Pat a little chicken. He did not like to go to bed at night. Mother hen would say, "It time for bed." But Pat would say, "I don't want to go to no bed." All the little chickens would say, "Pat be playing when it time for bed." One night Pat mother say, "We

going to bed. Pat want to stay up. He like to play. We will see do he like to stay up all night," Then she say, "Pat he a bad little chicken." Mother hen and all the little chickens they got in bed. Pat he say to his self, "They done went to bed. I going to play all night." He run all around the farm playing. Then he seen a cow. "He look like he will play with me," Pat say. He walked up to the cow to see could he get the cow to play. But the cow was asleep! He taken a walk to find the pig. But the pig was asleep! Pat say, "All the animals be sleeping at night. Don't nobody want to play." Pat did not want to stay up no more. Pat was cold. He wanted to go to bed. But he did not have a bed. He had to stay up all night! In the morning mother hen she asked Pat, "Did you have a good time?" "No, no." "Will you go to bed at night?" asked mother hen. "Yes, yes." Now, Pat be the first little chicken in bed at night.

Data Collection Procedures:

After the initial screening session in which the sentence repetition task was administered, the subjects selected for the study participated in two separate testing sessions. In these sessions which lasted approximately 30 minutes each, the following procedures were employed:

1. Warm up: Testers spent a few minutes putting the subjects at ease and familiarizing them with a tape recorder.

2. Practice: Subjects read one of two stores in dialect in each session taken from the Dialect Readers developed by the Educational Study Center, Washington, D.C. The practice part of the session had two purposes: to familiarize the subjects with the whole testing procedure; and, to give the subjects a chance to see and read a dialect story. (See Appendix A.)

3. Reading the texts: Subjects read aloud a text in standard or dialect, this was tape recorded.

4. Text retell: Subjects retold the details of the texts they read.

5. Comprehension questions: Subjects answered 5 multiple-choice comprehension questions. The questions and the choices were read to the subjects.

Coding of Oral Reading Miscues:

The reading miscues were recorded in two stages. In the first stage, all deviations from the printed text were transcribed. Next, each deviation from the printed text was coded according to miscues categories (see "Dependent Variables," below).

The transcription stage was done first by one person, and then by two people working together. Since the transcribers could go back and listen to the tape as many times as it was necessary, there was a very high degree of agreement among the transcribers.

In the coding stage, two people coded the transcribed errors independently. Any conflict between coders was resolved by a third person.

Coding of Story Retell:

A list of 23 points covered in the text was compiled for each text. A coder listened to the retelling and checked off each point that a subject mentioned.

Description of Variables:

Independent Variables

There were five independent variables in the study, one manipulated variable and four status variables.

Manipulated Variable

1. Type of text, Standard and Dialect (ST/D): There were two types of text used in the study, standard and dialect. There were two stories and each one had a standard and a dialect version. This was necessary because of the repeated measure design employed.

Status Variables

1. Grade level (GR 2/GR 3): There were 35 subjects in grade 2, and 32 subjects in grade 3.

2. Sex (M/F): There were 40 males and 27 females.

3. Reading skill, high or low (HI/LO): Reading skill was measured by the total number of non-dialect related reading miscues made on the standard text. Total reading miscues dichotomized over both grades to form high and low reading groups. There were 30 subjects in the low group.

4. Degree of dialect (D HI/LO): The degree to which subjects were dialect speakers was dichotomized into high and low groups on the basis of the dialect index formed by dividing the number of dialect grammatical features produced on the sentence repetition task by the number of words produced on the task. The index was used in order to equalize the different number of sentences on the sentence repetition task used in each school. There were 33 subjects in the high group, and 34 subjects in the low group. Since the sentence repetition task was used in School B as a screening device to eliminate subjects, this variable suffers from some degree of restriction of range. Thus, differences between the high and low groups on the dependent variables tended to be minimized.

Dependent Variables

The dependent variables were grouped into four categories: comprehension, use of contextual information, use of graphophonic information, and dialect related miscues. Each of the four major categories were measured in more than one way. Thus, multiple measures were used for each of the major variables. The multivariate analysis described below allows groups of measures of the same concept to be analyzed together.

Comprehenson

Comprehension was measured by a multiple choice test, story recall and three types of reading miscues that correlate with comprehension.

1. Multiple-choice comprehension (ST COMP MC/D COMP MC): Six multiple choice questions with three choices for each question made up the comprehension test (See Appendix B).

2. Recall - unprompted (ST RECALL UMP/D RECALL UMP): The number of points out of 23 covered in the text that were mentioned by the subjects during the retelling of the story without prompting by the tester.

3. Recall - prompted (ST RECALL/D RECALL): The number of points out of 23 covered in the text that were mentioned by subjects during the retelling of the story that was prompted. The tester prompted by asking for more details from the story.

4. Recall - dialect (ST RECALL DIAL/D RECALL DIAL): The number of points out of the 23 points covered in

the text that were mentioned during the retelling of the story, including points mentioned after prompting by the tester. (See Appendix C for recall points.)

The following reading miscue tapes were used as indirect measures of comprehension because they have been found to be correlated with comprehension (Swanson, 1939):

5. Substitution miscues (ST SUB/D SUB): The number of times subjects read aloud a word different from the printed text excluding those substitutions involving dialect shifts, that is, when subjects substituted a dialect feature.

Example:

Observed response (OR): Pat a little chicken.

Expected response (ER): Pat is a little chicken.

6. Omission miscues (ST OM/D OM): The number of times subjects omitted a word or part of a word excluding omission that involved dialect shifts.

Example:

OR: Pat is a chicken.

ER: Pat is a little chicken.

7. Insertion miscues (ST INS/D INS): The number of times subjects read a word that was not printed in the text excluding those insertions involving dialect shifts.

Example:

OR: The little chickens got in the bed.

ER: The little chickens got in bed.

Contextual Information Variables

These variables measured subjects' ability to use syntactic and semantic context in reading. It is assumed that the greater the subjects' ability to use context the better their reading skill. The following miscue categories were used as indicators of the subjects' ability to use contextual information in reading:

1. Self correlation (ST SCORR/D SCORR): Percentage of non-dialect related substitutions, omissions or insertion miscues that were followed by the original expected response.

Example:

OR: Pat saw - said to himself.

ER: Pat said to himself.

Self corrections have been shown by Clay (1966) and Webber (1970) to distinguish good from poor readers. Self corrections are typically made when the original miscues do not fit into the context of the rest of the sentence and they appear to measure a subject's ability to use contextual information in reading. A greater number of self corrections indicates more efficient use of context in reading.

2. Syntactic acceptability - following context (ST SYN 1/D SYN 1): Percentage of non dialect related substitution, omission and insertion miscues that conformed to the total sentence context.

Example (syntactically acceptable):

OR: Sam lives on the farm.

ER: Sam lives on a farm.

Example (syntactically unacceptable):

OR: Pat was could.

ER: Pat was cold.

This variable appears to be a measure of a subject's ability to use bilatoral context in reading.

3. Syntactic acceptability - preceding context (ST SYN 2/D SYN 2): Percentage of non dialect related substitution, omission and insertion miscues that conform to the context preceding the miscues. A miscue is syntactically acceptable if the sentences up through the miscue can be completed as a grammatical sentence disregarding the rest of the printed sentence. Miscues on the first and last word of a sentence were not included in this category.

Example: (syntactically acceptable):

OR: All the little chickens will say, "Pat is..."

ER: All the little chickens would say, "Pat is..."

This variable appears to be a measure of a subject's ability to use the preceding context in reading.

4. Semantic acceptability (ST SEM/D SEM): The percentage of non dialect related substitution, omission and insertion miscues that maintained the original meaning of the sentence.

Example (semantically acceptable):

OR: I will go away from them trees.

ER: I will go away from those trees.

Example (semantically unacceptable):

OR: Pat is a little child.

ER: Pat is a little chicken.

This variable appears to be a measure of a subject's ability to use semantic and syntactic information in reading. It measures semantic as well as syntactic information because semantically acceptable errors are almost always syntactically acceptable.[2]

5. Repetitions (ST REP/D REP): The number of times subjects read a printed word aloud more than once excluding those instances when the word repeated was immediately preceding a point at which a dialect shift was possible.

Example:

OR: Pat is a little little chicken.

ER: Pat is a little chicken.

Repetitions often occurred when the following context was confusing and it was assumed that the number of repetitions was an indirect measure of subjects' abilities to use context.

Use of Graphophonic Information

The following variables were indicators of subjects' abilities to recognize words through the use of knowledge of the relationship between spelling and pronunciation:

---

2. The distinction between semantic and syntactic information is difficult to make linguistically; the three variables described (SYN L, SYN 2 and SEM) obviously overlap a great deal in that use of semantic as well as syntactic information is measured by each of these variables. The distinctions between the three variables can be considered to be very rough and approximate. All of them can be considered to be measuring use of context which includes syntactic and semantic information.

1. Graphic similarity - letters (ST GRAPHIC L/D GRAPHIC L): Graphic similarity - letters is a measure of the degree to which real word non dialect related miscues coincided with the letters of the printed stimulus word. The miscue was spelled in its usual way and compared to the stimulus word, using the following scoring system shown in Table 6:

TABLE 6: Graphic Similarity - Miscues

Part of Word	Letter Correspondence	Points
Beginning of Word:	First letter different	0
	First letter same	3
	First two or more letters same	4
Middle of Word:	No letters same	0
	One letter same	2
	Two or more letters same	3
End of Word:	Last letter different	0
	Last letter same	1
	Last two letters same	2

TOTAL GRAPHIC SIMILARITY - RANGE 0-15

For each subject the total graphic similarity score was divided by the total number of non-dialect related substitutions miscues. The more important weight given in the graphic similarity index to beginnings of words is based on the research of Levin and Marchbanks (1965) and other researchers who have shown that the beginnings of words are the most important in word recognition. The index used in this study showed a high correlation i.e. .89 with one developed by Weber (1970). Her index distinguished good and poor readers in a study of the reading miscues of first grade children.

2. Graphic similarity - shape (ST GRAPHIC SH/D GRAPHIC SH): A measure of subjects' abilities to use word shape in recognizing words. Each miscue that received a graphic similarity letter score also received a shape score. The following system was used as shown in Table 7:

TABLE 7: Graphic Similarity - Scoring System

Printed Word	Miscue	Points
A - Length in number of letters	Same number of letters	2
	Differs by one letter	1
	Differs by two or more letters	0
B - Number of ascending letters	One point for each ascending letter in common irregardless of word	1-(or more)

TOTAL GRAPHIC SIMILARITY SHAPE: A+B

For each subject the total graphic similarity points were divided by the number of substitution miscues. This index is based on research that shows that word length and ascending letters provide cues to word recognition (See Anderson and Dearborn, 1952, for a review of these studies).

3. Word attack skills (ST WD ATTACK/D WD ATTACK): The percentage of times that a series of partial word responses ended with the expected response.

Example: Unsuccessful word attack

OR: /f/ - /fr/...fast little.

ER: First little...

This is a measure of subjects' skill in recognizing words on the basis of the relationship between spelling and pronunciation.

Dialect Related Miscues

These were miscues that appeared to be influenced by subjects' dialect. They include shifting from dialect to standard features and from standard to dialect features, self corrections at conflict points and repetitions at or before conflict points.

1. Dialect shifting at controlled conflict points [ST TDIAL SH (S→D)/D TDIAL SH (D→S)]: The total number of times a subject shifted from a standard feature to a dialect feature while reading the standard text, or shifted from a dialect feature to a standard feature while reading the dialect text. Only controlled conflict points were considered in this total. Table 8 shows examples of the dialect shifting of the particular features that were counted in the total dialect shift variable.

TABLE 8: Examples of Dialect Shifts at Controlled Conflict Points

Shift Feature	Standard Text (S→D)	Dialect Text (D→S)
	Present Tense	Present Tense
Copula	OR: This__ a story...	OR: This is a story...
	ER: This is a story...	ER: This a story...
	Present Progressive Tense	Present Progressive Tense
	OR: He__ eating...	OR: He is eating...
	ER: He is eating...	ER: He eating...
	Habitual Tense	Habitual Tense
	OR: He be playing...	OR: He is always playing...
	ER: He is always playing..	ER: He be playing...
Conditional	OR: I wonder do he like...	OR: I wonder if he likes...
	ER: I wonder if he likes..	ER: I wonder do he like...
Grammatical Lexical Substitution	OR: Pat say...	OR: Pat said...
	ER: Pat said...	ER: Pat say...
	OR: Sam said to his self...	OR: Sam said to himself...
	ER: Sam said to himself...	ER: Sam said to his self...
Negation	OR: He did not have no bed.	OR: He did not have a bed.
	ER: He did not have a bed.	ER: He did not have no bed.

TABLE 8 - Continued

Possessive	OR: Sam Mother... ER: Sam's Mother...	OR: Sam's Mother... ER: Sam Mother...
Third Person Singular, Present Tense	OR: He like... OR: He likes...	OR: He likes... ER: He like...
Irregular Verbs	Past Tense OR: He seen... ER: He saw...	Past Tense OR: He saw... ER: He seen...
	Present Perfect Tense OR: He has ate... ER: He has eaten...	Present Perfect Tense OR: He has eaten... ER: He has ate...
Auxiliary Verb	OR: He done ate... ER: He has eaten...	OR: He has eaten... ER: He done ate...
Pronominal Apposition	OR: Pat he said... ER: Pat said...	OR: Pat said... ER: Pat he said...

2. Repetition at or before controlled conflict point (ST REP CP/D REP CP): The number of times subjects read aloud a printed word more than once at or immediately preceding a conflict point.

Example:

OR: Pat a...Pat a little chicken
ER: Pat a little chicken

3. Self correction at controlled conflict point [ST SCORR (S→ D →S)/D SCORR (D→ S →D)]: The number of times a miscue at a conflict point which involved a dialect shift was followed by a shift back to the expected response.

Example (standard text):

OR: Pat a little...Pat is a little chicken
ER: Pat is a little chicken

Example (dialect text):

OR: Pat is a...Pat a little chicken.
ER: Pat a little chicken

4. Dialect shift at uncontrolled conflict points [ST DIAL SH UNC (S D)/D DIAL SH UNC (S D)]: This variable consisted of the total number of times subjects shifted from a standard feature to a dialect feature at an uncontrolled conflict point; that is, one which was not manipulated between the standard and dialect texts.

Other Variables

There are other variables that may have influenced the dependent variables and thus may have acted as alternative explanations to the findings of this study. These variables are the difficulty of text, the order of presentation between the dialect and the standard text and the influence of the experimenter. Each of these is discussed separately, below.

Four texts were used in the study. Two stories were written both in standard and dialect versions. Attempts were made to equate all four texts. If one or more of the texts was easier than the others, then text types (standard or dialect) might be confounded with ease or difficulty of story (Pig or Chicken). This might lead to a false conclusion concerning the differences between the dialect and standard texts. Table 9 shows the difficulty of the texts as measured by COMP, MC, RECALL, and TOT ERRORS:[3]

TABLE 9: Difficulty of Four Texts

	Text A (Pig)				Text B (Chicken)			
	Standard		Dialect		Standard		Dialect	
Variables	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD
COMP. MC	4.62	1.69	4.68	1.30	4.58	1.44	4.61	1.68
RECALL	6.97	4.93	6.16	4.71	7.91	4.93	7.11	4.68
TOT ERRORS	21.59	19.41	18.90	13.41	14.15	9.52	18.39	15.91

None of the differences are significant on the COMP, MC and RECALL measures. However, total errors on Text B standard version produced fewer reading errors than the other texts. The difference between Text B standard and Text A standard approaches but does not reach significance. All the other differences are non-significant. There is the possibility that the fewer errors produced on Text B standard may have worked against the hypothesis of this study that involved miscue analysis.

3. TOT ERRORS is the total number of non-dialect relates substitutions, omissions and insertions.

Eight graduate students (one Black, seven white) administered the instruments of the study. These experimenters may have influenced the findings through their expectations about the hypothesis or in some other way. However, a series of one-way analyses of variance of the differences between experimenters on COMP MC, RECALL and TOT ERRORS revealed no difference between them. Thus, differences between experimenters did not appear to have influenced the results.

CHAPTER III - ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction:

The hypotheses of this study were analyzed through a series of multivariate analyses of variance. In this analysis, the difference between the dialect and standard texts was analyzed for the total group on a set of measures for each of the dependent variables: comprehension, context, graphophonic and dialect related miscues.[2] This analysis was repeated for subgroups of subjects divided by reading level, degree of dialect, grade level and sex.

Results:

The results are reported separately for each hypothesis of the study.

Hypothesis 1, Comprehension: BD speaking second and third grade children will read dialect texts with greater comprehension than when reading standard texts.

This hypothesis was tested by a multivariate analysis of the difference between standard and dialect texts on the comprehension measures. Table 10 presents the comprehension measures for the standard and dialect texts for the total group. The multivariate comprehension for all the measures taken together was nonsignificant. The univariate F scores for each of the measures taken separately were also nonsignificant.

TABLE 10: Univariate and Multivariate Analysis--ST and DIAL Texts on Comprehension Measures

Variable	ST Text $\bar{X}$	ST Text SD	DIAL Text $\bar{X}$	DIAL Text SD	Univariate F	P Less Than
COMP MC	4.74	1.35	4.78	1.28	0.101	.75
RECALL	7.66	4.81	6.98	4.55	2.475	.12
RECALL UMP	7.48	4.88	6.79	4.80	2.372	.13
RECALL DIAL	4.88	2.77	5.03	2.94	0.063	.80
SUB	12.73	11.29	14.19	11.80	1.779	.19
OM	3.01	4.54	3.28	4.34	0.354	.55
INS	2.16	2.31	2.31	2.24	0.279	.59

1. The results reported here will focus mainly on multivariate tests of significance. With one exception, a significant multivariant F will be considered important enough to discuss in detail. This procedure will be followed because of the large number of univariate tests that have been made and the desire to minimize type I error.

The multivariate analysis of subgroups is presented in Table 11. None of the multivariate tests were significant. The results of the analysis of the comprehension measures did not support hypothesis 1. There were no differences between the standard and dialect texts on the comprehension measures

TABLE 11: Multivariate Analysis of Comprehension RECALL, RECALL UNP, RECALL DIAL, SUB, OM, INS, COMP MC

Variable	d/f	F	P Less Than
TEXT (ST-D)	7/45	0.956	.47
TEXT x GRADE (G)	7/45	1.083	.39
TEXT x DIAL (D)	7/45	0.412	.89
TEXT x READ (R)	7/45	0.835	.56
TEXT x SEX (S)	7/45	1.111	.37
TEXT x G x D	7/45	0.106	.38
TEXT x G x R	7/45	0.761	.62
TEXT x G x S	7/45	0.904	.51
TEXT x D x R	7/45	1.455	.21
TEXT x D x S	7/45	0.826	.57
TEXT x R x S	7/45	2.162	.056
TEXT x G x D x R	7/45	0.324	.94
TEXT x G x D x S	7/45	0.764	.62
TEXT x G x R x S	7/45	0.660	.70
TEXT x D x R x S	7/45	0.376	.91
TEXT x G x R x D x S	7/45	0.438	.87

Hypothesis 2, Context: BD speaking second and third grade children will exhibit greater use of context when reading dialect texts than when reading standard texts.

This hypothesis was tested by a multivariate analysis of the difference between the standard and dialect texts on the context measures. Table 12 presents the context measures for the standard and dialect texts for the total group.

TABLE 12: Univariate and Multivariate Analysis ST - DIAL Texts on Context Measures

Variable	ST text %	DIAL text %	Univariate F	P Less Than
SCORR	26.1	37.1	0.950	.33
SYN 1	38.6	40.8	0.085	.77
SYN 2	28.3	28.0	0.407	.53
SEM	43.3	39.3	1.33	.25
	$\bar{X}$ S.D.	$\bar{X}$ S.D.		
REP	4.62 4.46	4.75 4.69	0.616	.81
		Multivariate F:	0.879	
		P Less Than:	.52	

The multivariate comparison for all measures taken together was nonsignificant as were the univariate F's taken separately. The multivariate analysis of subgroups is presented in Table 13. None of these multivariate tests were significant. The results of the analysis of the context measures offers no support for hypothesis 2. There were no differences between the standard and dialect texts on the context measures.

TABLE 13: Multivariate Analysis of Context Measures--SCORR, SYN 1, SYN 2, SEM, REP

Variable	d/f	F	P Less Than
TEXT (ST-D)	6/46	0.879	.52
TEXT x GRADE (G)	6/46	0.291	.28
TEXT x DIAL (D)	6/46	0.800	.56
TEXT x READING (R)	6/46	0.779	.59
TEXT x SEX (S)	6/46	0.912	.10
TEXT x G x D	6/46	0.992	.44
TEXT x G x R	6/46	1.050	.40
TEXT x G x S	6/46	0.352	.25
TEXT x D x R	6/46	0.675	.67
TEXT x D x S	6/46	1.210	.32
TEXT x R x S	6/46	0.258	.95
TEXT x G x D x R	6/46	0.910	.49
TEXT x G x D x S	6/46	0.879	.52
TEXT x G x R x S	6/46	0.280	.29
TEXT x D x R x S	6/46	0.526	.79
TEXT x G x R x D x S	6/46	0.439	.85

Hypothesis 3, Graphophonic: BD speaking second and third grade children will exhibit greater use of graphophonic information when reading dialect texts than when reading standard texts.

This hypothesis was tested by multivariate analysis of the differences between the standard and dialect texts on the graphphonic measures. Table 14 presents the graphophonic measures for the standard and dialect texts for the total group. The multivariate comparison for all measures taken together was nonsignificant. The univariate F's for each measure taken separately were also nonsignificant.

TABLE 14: Univariate and Multivariate Analysis ST--DIAL Texts in Graphophonic Measures (N=67)

	ST Text		DIAL Text			
Variable	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	Univariate	P Less Than
GRAPHIC L	2.72	1.19	2.91	1.26	0.878	.35
GRAPHIC S	1.84	0.99	1.93	0.67	1.362	.25
	%		%			
WD ATTACK	46.0		37.9		0.275	.60
				Multivariate:		
				0.485	.690	

The multivariate analysis of subgroups is presented in Table 15. None of the multivariate tests were significant. The results of the analysis of the graphophonic measures offers no support for hypothesis 3. There were no differences between the standard and dialect texts on the graphophonic measures

TABLE 15: Multivariate Analysis of Graphophonic Measures GRAPHIC L, GRAPHIC S, WD ATTACK

Variable	d/f	F	P Less than
TEXT (ST-D)	3/49	0.485	.69
TEXT x GRADE (G)	3/49	2.660	.06
TEXT x DIAL (D)	3/49	1.222	.31
TEXT x READ (R)	3/49	0.375	.77
TEXT x SEX (S)	3/49	1.115	.35
TEXT x G x D	3/49	0.653	.58
TEXT x G x R	3/49	0.613	.61
TEXT x G x S	3/49	0.646	.59
TEXT x D x R	3/49	1.467	.24
TEXT x D x S	3/49	0.445	.72
TEXT x R x S	3/49	1.011	.40
TEXT x G x D x R	3/49	1.896	.14
TEXT x F x D x S	3/49	0.174	.91
TEXT x F x R x S	3/49	0.080	.97
TEXT x D x R x S	3/49	1.697	.18
TEXT x F x R x D x S	3/49	1.376	.26

Hypothesis 4, Dialect-related Variables: BD speaking second and third grade children will exhibit fewer dialect-related errors when reading dialect texts than when reading standard texts.

This hypothesis was tested by a multivariate and univariate analysis of the difference between the standard and dialect texts on the dialect-related measures. Table 16 presents the dialect-related variables for the standard and dialect texts for the total group. The multivariate comparison for all measures taken together is statistically significant. Three out of the four univariate tests were highly significant. There was a significant tendency to shift from dialect to standard more often than from standard to dialect. There were also more repetitions before and at conflict points in the dialect text than in the standard text. There were more self-corrections in the dialect text than in the standard text. Finally, there was no difference between the standard and dialect texts in the amount of dialect shifting at uncontrolled conflict points.

Thus, none of the four variables tested support hypothesis 3. In fact, for three of the four variables the findings are in the opposite direction to those predicted by hypothesis 3.

TABLE 16: Univariate and Multivariate Analysis ST-DIAL Texts on Dialect-Related Measures

Variable	ST Text $\bar{X}$	ST Text SD	DIAL Text $\bar{X}$	DIAL Text SD	Univariate F	P Less Than
T DIAL SH	1.69 (S—D)	1.49	5.42 (S—D)	3.21	71.572	.0001
T DIAL SH UNC	1.45	2.28	1.70	2.01	0.855	.3595
SCORR CP	0.27 (S—D—S)	0.54	0.91 (D—S—D)	1.16	13.798	.0006
REP CP	1.81	1.79	3.39	2.74	36.708	.0001

Multivariate F: 20.308
P Less Than: .0001

Table 17 presents the multivariate analysis of the subgroups on the dialect-related variables. Only one multivariate F is significant, and this was probably due to chance. The multivariate F's for the subgroups offer no support for hypothesis 3.

TABLE 17: Multivariate Analysis of Dialect Related Variables: T DIAL, SH, T DIAL SH UNC, SCORR CP, REP CP

Variable	d/f	F	P Less Than
TEXT (ST - D)	5/47	20.308	.0001
TEXT x GRADE (G)	5/47	1.822	.13
TEXT x DIAL (D)	5/47	1.068	.390
TEXT x READ (R)	5/47	2.392	.05
TEXT x SEX (S)	5/47	0.558	.73
TEXT x G x D	5/47	1.205	.32
TEXT x G x R	5/47	1.338	.26
TEXT x G x S	5/47	0.980	.44
TEXT x D x R	5/47	0.879	.50
TEXT x D x S	5/47	1.720	.15
TEXT x R x S	5/47	0.589	.71
TEXT x G x D x R	5/47	0.483	.79
TEXT x G x D x S	5/47	1.103	.37
TEXT x G x R x S	5/47	1.332	.27
TEXT x D x R x S	5/47	1.368	.25
TEXT x G x R x D x S	5/47	2.432	.05

The tendency to shift more often from standard to dialect than from dialect to standard indicates that the subjects of this study found printed dialect features less "natural" to read than the corresponding standard features.

The origin of this tendency is suggested by the interaction of grade and T DIAL SH presented in Table 18.

TABLE 18: Text (ST-D) x GRADE Interaction on T DIAL SH

	T DIAL SH				
Variable	ST Text (S D) $\bar{X}$	DIAL Text (D S) $\bar{X}$	Diff	F	P Less Than
Grade 2	1.7143	4.485	-2.771	5.181	.027
Grade 3	1.656	6.438	-4.781		

The longer a subject is in school, the greater is his tendency to shift into standard when reading the dialect text. The low frequency of shifting from standard to dialect when reading the standard text doesn't change as length of story increases. This tendency to maintain a standard rendition of the text is probably the result of the effects of the subjects only having experiences of seeing standard features in print, plus the tendency of teachers to discourage the use of dialect features when reading orally. It suggests that the more exposure that subjects have to texts written in dialect the greater would be their tendency to maintain the dialect features rather than shifting to standard features.

This might at first appear to support the use of dialect readers in teaching reading in order to reduce reading interference. This suggestion is based on the assumption that dialect shifting is an indicator of reading interference. It is not at all clear that this assumption is tenable. In fact, there is evidence to the contrary. This evidence is presented in Table 19.

TABLE 19: Correlations: TOT DIAL SH vs COMPREHENSION

	ST Text		DIAL Text	
Variables	r	P Less Than	r	P Less Than
TOT DIAL SH vs:				
TOT ERRORS	.364	.003	.143	.25
RECALL UNP	-.143	.250	.205	.10
RECALL TOT	-.192	.120	.128	.30
RECALL DIAL	.209	.070	.206	.10
COMP MC	-.238	.053	.220	.08

If dialect shifting interfered with comprehension, then one indicator of this interference would be significant positive correlation between dialect shifting. As can be seen from Table 19, all comprehension measures are nonsignficant with the exception of total

errors in the standard text. However, this one exception--while significant--is rather small accounting for only 13% of the variance and it is probably unimportant. These correlations suggest that dialect shifting is not an important factor in reading interference.

Summary:

The findings on each of the hypothesis are reported below:

Hypothesis 1: BD speaking second and third grade children will read dialect texts with greater comprehension than standard texts. The data from this study does not support this hypothesis.

Hypothesis 2: BD speaking second and third grade children will read dialect texts with greater use of contextual information than when reading standard texts. The data from this study does not support this hypothesis.

Hypothesis 3: BD speaking second and third grade children will exhibit greater use of graphophonic information when reading dialect texts than when reading standard texts. The data from this study does not support this hypothesis.

Hypothesis 4: BD speaking second and third grade children will exhibit fewer dialect-related miscues when reading dialect texts than when reading standard texts. The data from this study does not support this hypothesis.

This study provides no evidence that BD speaking second and third grade children read dialect texts any better than they read standard texts; therefore, this study provides no support for the operation of grammatical reading interference in Black children's reading.

CHAPTER IV - CONCLUSIONS

Grammatical reading interference which results from a mismatch between Black children's dialect and the standard English used in their reading materials is not a major cause of the poor reading achievement of Black Children. This conclusion is suggested by the negative findings of this study and of the Shaaf (1971) and Sims (1972) studies described in Chapter I. However, before this conclusion can be accepted, it is necessary to deal with some possible limitations of this study which may tend to weaken the above conclusion. These potential limitations are discussed below.

The first limitation pertains to the question of the degree to which the subjects of this study were dialect speakers. There is a great deal of variation in the proportion of dialect features exhibited by Blacks. These proportions are influenced by social class, age, sex and the speech situation. Given this variation it seems plausible to argue that only Black children who exhibit a high proportion of dialect are subject to reading interference, while those who exhibit a lesser degree of dialect are not. Thus, one might argue that the reason grammatical reading interference was not demonstrated in this study was because the subjects were not heavy dialect speakers.

In response to this argument it should be pointed out that on the measure of degree of dialect used in this study, i.e. a sentence repetition task, subjects produced dialect features approximately 25% of the time. This percentage compares favorably with the findings of the two other studies which employed a sentence repetition task. Housh (1972) found that third grade Black children shifted into Black dialect 31% of the time, while Hall and Freedle (1972) found that eight year old Black children shifted into Black dialect 22% of the time, and ten year old Black children shifted into Black dialect 20% of the time. From these percentages, it seems clear that the subjects of the present study were not atypical with regard to the proportion of dialect features produced on a sentence repetition task.[1]

It should also be pointed out that in the experience of the investigators of this study, the subjects are typical of Black children in the San Francisco Bay Area. Therefore, to argue that the subjects of this study and other children with the same or lesser degree of dialect are not subject to reading interference would seriously limit the number of Black children for whom grammatical reading interference might be a problem. If San Francisco Bay Area Black children are typical of other ghetto children around the country, the hypothesis that BD

---

1. The percentage of dialect shifting found on sentence repetition tasks may seem low when compared to the use of dialect in free speech. It should be pointed out that this involves a relatively formal speech situation. Since frequency of use of dialect features is influenced the situation, the percentages reported here are not particularly low. These subjects would be expected to exhibit a higher percentage of dialect features in their free speech.

interfers with learning to read would be seriously weakened since it only would account for a small proportion of Black children with reading problems.

Another problem in the study is that subjects who could not read every other word in the texts were dropped. These subjects were in effect non-readers. It might be the case that these were precisely the subjects who might be expected to experience grammatical reading interference and their exclusion from the study weighted against the hypothesis of reading interference. However, the effect of this factor is impossible to estimate since the excluded subjects failed to complete the reading of the texts. Non-readers, however, were only a small proportion of the total subjects tested.

Another possible limitation concerns the nature of the texts used in the study. In order to provide a test of grammatical reading interference, it is necessary that the dialect texts be closer to the speech of the subjects with respect to dialect than the standard texts. On the face of it, this condition was met since the dialect texts contained dialect features while the standard texts did not. However, the extent to which the dialect texts matched the speech of the subjects and whether this match would be sufficient to show interference are open questions. Due to the nature of the repeated measure design, it was impossible to match the frequency of occurrence of dialect features for the subjects of this study. Also the selection of features was to some degree arbitrary. All that can be said about the reading materials employed in this study is that the dialect text was closer to the speech of the subject than the standard text. Whether the difference between standard and dialect texts is great enough to show reading interference given the sensitivity of the measuring instruments remains an open question. All that is claimed is that the degree of difference between the texts of this study failed to show reading interference. It is possible that another study which matched the children's dialect more closely might show interference. However, since the Schaaf (1971) and Sims (1972) studies used materials which matched the children's speech to different degrees than the present study and these studies also found no interference, it is not clear that changing the materials to provide a closer match to the children's speech would change the findings.

Another limitation of the present study concerns the length of the experiment and the number of reading texts employed. It may be the case that the treatment may have been too brief to show a difference in reading. A test over a longer period of time employing more reading materials may be necessary to demonstrate reading interference.

One might expect the subjects to do better on the standard text in this study because of their exclusive exposure to standard texts throughout their years in school. The finding of no difference between the standard and dialect texts, however, suggests that a longer treatment period might produce different results. If subjects had learned to read with dialect texts, they might read them better than standard texts. It may be that the most appropriate test of the reading interference hypothesis would involve an experiment lasting two or more

years in which one group of Black children were taught with dialect texts while another equivalent group were taught with standard texts. However, the probability of this type of a long-term experiment producing definite results is, in the opinion of the authors, quite low. First, there are the almost insurmountable practical and theoretical problems of conducting long term large scale curriculum experiments in the schools. One need only examine the large number of reading method experiments to realize how difficult they are to conduct adequately and how inconclusive their results are. Secondly, the political, emotional and cultural controversies surrounding the issue of using materials written in dialect in the schools are so great that an objective unbiased large scale study of the question appears highly improbable.

It seems that all of the limitations discussed above might be overcome by studies of longer duration, employing different materials and with possibly different populations. If such studies were conducted and produced different results and did succeed in demonstrating reading interference, then the suggestion of employing dialect readers to reduce interference would receive strong support. However, if reading interference caused by the difference between the Black child's language and the language of the texts that are read in school cannot be demonstrated, then the use of dialect readers alone would be unlikely to improve the reading performance of Black dialect speaking children.

Unless the negative findings of this study and the Shaaf (1971) and Sims (1972) studies can be refuted in future studies, it appears that those concerned with the poor reading performance of Black children must look beyond dialect readers per se for a remedy to this problem.

There is some evidence that the problem goes beyond the question of direct interference investigated in this study. Peistrup (1973) provides some of this evidence. She studied the manner in which first grade teachers responded to Black children's use of dialect during reading instruction. She found that there was great variation in the way teachers responded to dialect and that this variation resulted in differences in reading achievement. She found numerous examples of teachers confusing Black students when the children used dialect during reading instruction. This teacher behavior was presumably the product of the teachers' negative attitude toward dialect and their lack of knowledge of how to handle it during reading instruction.

The Piestrap study plus the authors' observations in many urban schools and their work with teachers of Black dialect children suggests that the teachers' handling of dialect during reading instuction is a very important factor in Black children's poor reading performance.

Future research should turn to the analysis of the instructional process in the classroom and the complicated interaction between BD speaking children and teaching procedures, teachers'

the materials used for teaching reading. Research into these processes may be the most fruitful way to provide the information necessary to recommend changes in the reading instruction of Black children.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, I. and Dearborn, W. The psychology of reading. New York: Ronald Press, 1952.

Baratz, J. "A review of research on the relationship of black english to reading." Paper presented to the International Reading Association, Atlantic City, 1971.

_____ "Teaching reading in an urban negro school system." In Baratz, J. and Shuy, R. (Ed.) Teaching black children to read. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969. 92-116.

Clay, M. "Reading errors and self-correction behavior." British journal of educational psychology, 1969, 39. 47-56.

Coleman, J. Equality of education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1966.

Dillard, J. Black english. New York: Random House, 1971.

Fasold, R. and Wolfram, W. "Some linguistic features of negro dialect." In Fasold, R. and Shuy, R. (Ed.) Teaching standard in the inner city. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1970. 41-86.

Hall, W. and Freedl, R. "Towards the identification of cognitive operations in standard and non-standard english usage." Paper presented at MIMH conference on cognition and language development of the black child, New Orleans, 1973.

Housh, J. Delayed response time of black third grade children in a sentence imitation task of black english and standard sentences. (Masters thesis, University of California) Berkeley, California, 1972.

Johnson, K. "The influence of nonstandard negro dialect on reading achievement." In Jacobson, R. (Ed.) Studies in english to speakers of other languages and standard english to speakers of a nonstandard dialect. Special anthology issue monograph 14, English record, 1971. 148-154.

Labov, W. Cohen, P. Robins, C. and Lewis, J. "A study of the non-standard english of negro and puerto rican speakers in new york city." Cooperative research project no. 3288. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1968.

_____"Some sources of reading problems for negro speakers of non-standard english." Paper presented to the National Council of Teachers of English spring institute, Chicago, 1966.

Levin, H. and Marchbanks, G. "Cues by which children recognize words." Journal of educational psychology, 1965, 56. 57-61.

BIBLIOGRAPHY - continued

Mathewson, G. "Children's response to reading and hearing standard english and nonstandard dialect stories: a study of evaluation and comprehension. Paper presented to the American Education Research Association, New Orleans, 1973.

McCormick, A. Accommodation of reading instruction for first grade, black dialect speaking children. (Doctoral dissertation, University of California) Berkeley, California, 1973.

NAEP. "Reading assessment: selected exercies. National assessment of education progress. Report 02-R-20. Denver: Education Commission of the States- 1970-71.

Rentel, V. and Kennedy, J. "Effect of pattern drill on the phonolgy, syntax and ready achievement of rural appalachian children. American educational research journal, 1972, 9. 87-100.

Ruddell, R. "An investigation of the effect of the similarity of oral and written patterns of language structure in reading comprehension. (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University) Bloomington, Indiana, 1963.

Schaaf, E. A study of black english syntax and reading and reading comprehension. (Masters thesis, University of California) Berkeley, California, 1971.

Simons, H. "Black dialect and the acquisition of reading skills: a review of the research evidence." Unpublished manuscript, 1973.

Sims, R. A psycholinguistic description of miscues created by selected young readers during oral reading of texts in black dialect and standard english. (Doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University) Detroit, Michigan, 1972.

Southwest Regional Laboratory. The speech of young black children in los angeles. Los Angeles: Southwest Regional Laboratory, 1971.

Stewart, W. "Sociolinguistic factors in the history of american negro dialects." Florida fl reporter, 19-7, 5. 1-4.

_____ "On the use of negro dialect in the teaching of reading." In Baratz, J. and Shuy, R. (Ed.) Teaching black children to read. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969. 156-219.

Swanson, D. "Common elements in silent and oral reading." Psychology monographs, 1937, 48. 36-60.

Tatham, S. "Reading comprehension of materials written with select oral language patterns: a study at grades two and four." Reading research quarterly, 1970, 4. 402-426..

BIBLIOGRAPHY - continued

Weber, R. "First grader's use of grammatical context in reading." In Levin, H. and Williams, J. (Ed). Basic studies in reading. New York: Basic Books, 1970.

APPENDIX A

Practice I

Kim and Bill like to play hide and seek.

They hide together and then they want one of their sister or brother to find them.

Kim she all the time be saying, "Now we going to hide and you look for us."

Then Bill say, "We going to hide in the closet. You supposed to find us."

Or he say, "We going to be under the bed."

Roy always find them. Roy, he more older than they are and he think this is a silly way to play the game.

Appendix A - Continued)

Practice II

In the summer Tom be outside a lot.

Sometime he get into trouble playing with other children.

He keep on getting into fights.

The other day Kim come home and tell her mother about Tom.

She say, "Tom push Bill and Bill, he fall on the baby.

Then the baby cry a long time and her mother got real mad."

Bill he don't want to do that no more.

APPENDIX B

Multiple Choice Comprehension Test

Pig Text

1. A good name for this story is:

   1) The Bear that Ran Away.
   2) The Pig that Ran Away.
   3) The Bear that Ate the Pig.

2. The day after Sam saw the bear he:

   1) stayed at home.
   2) ran back to the woods.
   3) went to find a bear.

3. Sam lived:

   1) in the woods.
   2) on a farm.
   3) in a zoo.

4. The hole in the fence helped Sam to:

   1) find a bear to play with.
   2) get out of the farm.
   3) find something to eat.

5. Sam's mother told him:

   1) that bears eat once a day.
   2) that bears are good.
   3) that bears eat all the time.

6. How do you think Sam felt when he saw the bear?

   1) happy
   2) mad
   3) scared

APPENDIX B - Continued

Multiple Choice Comprehension Test

Chicken Text

1. A good name for this story is:

   1) The Little Chicken Who Liked to Go to Bed.
   2) The Little Chicken Who Did Not Like to Go to Bed.
   3) The Cow Who Went to Sleep.

2. Pat goes to bed at night now because:

   1) staying up all night is no fun.
   2) he lives on a farm.
   3) the cow and the pig told him to go to sleep at night.

3. Pad did not have a good time because:

   1) the cow was playing.
   2) the pig was walking.
   3) all the animals were sleeping at night.

4. Mother hen and the other little chickens:

   1) got in bed.
   2) stayed up all night.
   3) walked all night.

5. Pat saw:

   1) a cow walking.
   2) a pig eating.
   3) a cow and a pig sleeping.

6. How do you think Pat felt the morning after he stayed up all night?

   1) surpised
   2) mad
   3) sorry

APPENDIX C

NAME _____ SCHOOL _____

GRADE _____ SEX _____ ROOM _____ TEACHER _____

PIG STORY

Total Recall Points	Recall Unpromted	Recall Prompted	Dialect Conflict Points
Sam is a little pig.			
He lives on a farm.			
*He wanted to go away from the farm.			
*He found a hole in the fence.			
He looked to see if he could get out.			
*He did get out.			
He ran out into the woods, and said he was happy to be in the woods.			
*He looked at all the things in the woods.			
He saw a bear!			
He said, "That bear looks bad, and he's a big bear, too.			
He also looks like he wants to eat.			
He is eating some nuts off a tree."			
Sam said, "I wonder if he likes to eat little pigs?"			
Sam did not want a bear to eat him!			
Sam's mother told him that bears are always eating.			
Sam hid in some trees.			
*The bear went away.			
Sam said, "That bear has eaten all the nuts.			
Sam ran back to the farm.			
*He looked for the hole in the fence.			
*He went under it.			
*He was happy to be back on the farm.			
He said, "The woods are not for me! I don't ever want to go to the woods again!"			
TOTAL			

APPENDIX C - Continued

NAME _____ SCHOOL _____

GRADE _____ SEX _____ ROOM _____ TEACHER _____
GRAD

CHICKEN STORY

Total Recall Points Total Recall Points	Recall Unpromted	Recall Prompted	Dialect Conflict Points
Pat is a little chicken	_____	_____	_____
*He did not like to go to bed at night.	_____	_____	
Mother hen would say, "It is time for bed."	_____	_____	_____
All the little chickens would say, "Pat is always playing when it is time for bed."	_____	_____	_____
Pat's mother said, "We will see if he likes to play all night.	_____	_____	_____
Pat is a bad little chicken."	_____	_____	_____
Mother hen and all the other little chickens got in bed.	_____	_____	_____
Pat said, "I am going to play all night."	_____	_____	_____
He ran all around the farm playing.	_____	_____	_____
He saw a cow.	_____	_____	_____
He walked over to see if the cow could play.	_____	_____	_____
*The cow was asleep!	_____	_____	
He took a walk to find the pig.	_____	_____	_____
*The pig was asleep!	_____	_____	_____
Pat said, "all the animals are sleeping at night."	_____	_____	_____
Pat did not want to stay up anymore.	_____	_____	_____
*He was cold.	_____	_____	_____
He did not have a bed, and had to stay up.	_____	_____	_____
Mother hen asked Pat, "Did you have a good time?"	_____	_____	_____
*"No, no."	_____	_____	
*"Will you go to bed at night?" asked Mother hen.	_____	_____	

APPENDIX C - Continued

Total Recall Points	Recall Unprompted	Recall Prompted	Dialect Conflict Points
*"Yes, yes."			
Pat is the first little chicken in bed at night.			
TOTAL			